1234
F73
opy 1

10 CENTS

Fonseca, Carlo de

What the Catholic Church has Done to Mexico

By DR. A. PAGANEL

17-25107

✠ ✠ ✠

With a reply by

CARDINAL FARLEY

✠ ✠ ✠

LATIN-AMERICAN NEWS ASSOCIATION
1400 BROADWAY :-: :-: NEW YORK, 1916.

F1234
.F73

F.B.M. 1916-12-26

✠ ✠ ✠

What the Catholic Church has Done to Mexico

✠ ✠ ✠

What the Catholic Church has done to Mexico.

A short historical sketch of the work and influence wrought by the Catholic Church in Mexico since 1521, will not be found uninteresting to the Catholics, Protestants, Jews and even the Mormons of this country. American Catholics claim they do not tamper with politics; that this is one of the reasons for their high standing in the community. Lately, however, there has been a change in this policy; high dignitaries of the Church have come out in the press with worldly opinions on subjects such as suffrage and Mexican affairs. They have attacked the representatives of the different parties in Mexico and members of the Wilson administration have not escaped, but this same Church and friends have consistently defended Huerta and his régime, and have initiated a campaign of agitation against the Constitutionalists in favor of American Intervention.

If the high dignitaries of the Catholic Church want to meddle in politics then they surely must not claim immunity from counter attacks or hide under the cloak of religion or of their own sacred personalities. Besides, the American Catholic laymen want to be informed of both sides of the controversy.

* * * * *

When Hernando Cortez had conquered Mexico in 1521, he soon realized that soldiers alone could not control the millions of Indians which had come under the rule of the Spanish king. Thousands of priests, nuns and friars were, therefore, imported from Spain; the priests soon settled in the cities and the monks in the country. They established and built monasteries and churches from Uruguay to California. In 1524, four Bishoprics were founded, in 1571 the Holy Inquisition was established by the Dominicans and two years later the first "auto da fe" act of faith took place. The Jesuits arrived in Mexico in 1572. It can be safely asserted that the colonization of New Spain was achieved by the different religious orders; they christianized the Indians and made them work on churches, monasteries and on their farms for their own benefit.

The Jesuits and the Franciscans did endeavor to foster learning in the new land, but with limited success, owing to the fact that they taught only the sons of Spaniards and the Indians they taught to memorize the prayers in their own language. Although they were expelled in 1767, their work was very useful and they made themselves conspicuous from the other orders in the zeal with which they noticed the observances of their own rules. They were the teachers of the creoles and mestizos of New Spain, and dominated by their science, sobriety, chastity and their insinuating spirit.

It is a strange commentary on the logic of Catholics that they consider the expulsion of religious orders from Mexico under the Laws of the Reform (1859) for meddling in politics, as an unjust measure and an attack on religious liberty, when as a fact, they never protested when that most Catholic majesty, the king of Spain, Charles

III, expelled the Jesuits from Spain and from New Spain because they were accused of playing politics. Besides, they were suspected of entertaining certain doctrines on regicide; that is to say, the right to kill rulers when they were tyrants. There was an attempt on the life of the Portuguese sovereign and as the Jesuits were accused as being responsible for it, they were exiled from Portugal. The same measures were taken against them in France. Not only were the Jesuits expelled from Spain and the whole of New Spain, but their property and real estate were confiscated. They possessed great capitals, outstanding loans, haciendas, houses and churches.

In the three hundred years of Spanish rule in Mexico there were sixty-two viceroys, out of these, ten prelates, mostly of the Dominican order, held office as viceroys ad interim. The Dominicans had been the dominating power in Mexico. The influence of the religious orders was beneficial until the end of the sixteenth century. Their religious zeal went so far in the beginning, that all vestige of Aztec and other pre-Spanish civilization was destroyed by order of the friars. Thus many very valuable historical documents, such as old parchments, books, maps, Aztec statuary, teaocallis or temples, were lost to the world.

Among the most prominent representatives of the Church we must mention such men as Fray Vasco de Quiroga, a real saint who was venerated for his Christian virtues. Fray Pedro de Gante, related to Charles V of Spain, known as a teacher and an organizer of schools of industrial arts. Fray Bernardino de Sahugan, author of books on pre-Spanish history, as well as Fray Javier de Alegre and the famous Fray F. J. Clavijero.

These names, as well as others, should be inscribed on the golden scroll of pre-Spanish history; nevertheless there is a seamy side to this silver lining.

As soon as this religoius order became wealthy, the spiritual part of its work was neglected and a majority of the clergy became imbued with the idea that their power over the colonists would be increased with their wealth and their political importance. Many prelates considered themselves superior to the military and civil authorities as was the case with the Archbishop Don Juan Perez de la Serna.

The then viceroy, Marquis de Gelnes, incurred the enmity of this strong-willed prelate, who rebelled against the authority of the viceroy and was arrested. Thereupon De la Serna ex-communicated all his military guards and later even the viceroy. Things came to a point when the Archbishop's friends incited the people to real munity; convicts were liberated from prisons and attacked and looted the royal palace. The viceroy had to flee for his life, from Mexico to Spain and when another viceroy was sent to Mexico, Archbishop De la Serna was asked to appear before the King of Spain, who punished him by making him Bishop of Zamor in Spain.

During Spanish rule in Mexico a discussion arose in the mother country by a council of theologians as to whether the Indians had a

soul and if they were "gente de razon," that is to say, reasoning beings. It must be remembered that a question similar to this came up for discussion in Europe in A. D. 585, at the Council of Macon, as to whether woman possessed a soul. It was finally decided that she had all the possibilities of one. In the case of the Indian, they cut the gordian knot by saying that the Indians were men, but not quite finished or complete, more like children or minors and that, therefore, they should be subject to their masters and protected by their king and the Church. It can be readily imagined what kind of protection the poor Indian received, especially with monks as masters. When the Indians were told that they were under the protection of the king and the Church, they answered resignedly: "The king is in Spain and God is in Heaven."

The Inquisition or the Tribunal of the Faith.

The Holy Inquisition inquired with all available means into the thoughts and actions of men in religious matters. Not only the accused but likewise the informer were forced under penalty of torture to reveal family secrets. The tribunal was secret; therein resided its power. Its authority was unlimited as it did not depend upon any other court. In its absolutism it disposed without scruples of the liberty, honor, wealth and even life of any person. It imprisoned, defamed, confiscated, condemned to the "garrote" (strangulation by means of an iron collar), and it burned at the stake. Those accused of heresy were not confronted by their accuser. They were kept in solitary confinement, sometimes for years, until they underwent the torture to compel confession.

Judgment usually ended in exile, by imprisonment to the gallows, public whipping or death. Not even the dead or the absent escaped punishment; the bones of the former were incinerated, the latter were burned in effigy. There were special and general "autos da fe." In 1596 ten heretics were burned at the stake in Mexico City, mostly Jews and Protestants. An "auto da fe" was considered an excuse for a feast day.

During the ten years of the struggle for Independence the Inquisition persecuted the revolutionists and the inquisitors were called the agents of despotism. Hidalgo and Morelos were the most conspicuous victims and martyrs of the Inquisition. Abad y Queipo, Bishop of Michoacan excommunicated Hidalgo in September, 1810 and in December of the same year received him under a pall in Valladolid (Morelia) and celebrated his victories against the Spanish troops with a solemn "Te Deum" in the cathedral. A few years later the clergy became the alleged ally and protector of the successful revolutionists.

After the restoration of the Constitution (of 1812) in Spain, in the year 1820, the Inquisition was abolished in Mexico where it had enacted its judgments for the space of 294 years. The building of the Inquisition in Mexico City is now used as the Academy of Medicine. When the Inquisitorial office was abolished in 1820, in its dungeons was discovered, according to the account of an eyewitness "the Jew Chrisantos

Granados, called El Guatemalteco, true descendant of the Jews, who had been expelled from Portugal in the eighteenth century. He had on the crown of his hat a treatise on logic, which was his heresy. Another dungeon was unsealed and from it was taken out, one who looked like a skeleton, with a long beard. His crime consisted in speaking in favor of the Independence. He had also some lines on heresy, because he defined logic as the faculty of the human mind to direct all action in order to discover the truth. Faint cries in another dungeon brought the searchers to a naked, old man, who had his hands and feet in iron rings attached to a wooden cross. He had been there thirty years. The captain left the janitor like Adam, in order to clothe the skeleton of this martyr.

"There were thirty-nine prisoners and they, thinking that they were all going to be burned, asked: 'What is going to happen to us?' and the captain answered: 'Nothing, you are going to be free, for the Constitution of the year 1812 has been sworn by his majesty, the King of Spain and in virtue of that, this cursed tribunal is abolished.' The prisoners were taken before the viceroy, Don Juan de Apodaca, Count of Venadito, who gave them some money. Some had been in prison so many years they knew nobody living in the world. None knew which way to turn from the palace of the viceroy.

For three hundred years New Spain was surrounded by a Chinese wall of exclusion; exclusion of foreigners, of all education which was not religious and all commercial intercourse which did not come directly from Spain. A dozen ships which sailed twice a year from Sevilla to Mexico brought all the necessities and luxuries needed for a population of several millions and sailed back to the old country laden with the gold and silver of Mexico. The Index Expurgatorius of the Roman See saw to it that no books except inocuous religious treaties reached New Spain. This encouraged smuggling, intellectual as well as commercial.

A few years before the struggle for Independence the population of New Spain was about 5,300,000 inhabitants which were divided in this manner:

European (Spanish)	60,000
Creoles	900,000
Mestizos	1,500,000
Indians	2,850,000
Total	5,310,000

So there will be observed that in three hundred years the population had increased from a few million Indians and a handful of Spaniards to 900,000 creoles and a million and a half mestizos.

Decrees abolishing slavery were very numerous, but did not prevent this system of oppression from continuing.

The contempt for the mestizos was a great factor in the feeling of rebellion engendered against Spanish rule. So great was the contempt for the mestizos and even the creoles by the born Spaniards, that one

of the later viceroys, after the question of home rule had arisen, declared "that as long as a Castilian remained in the country, though he were no more than a cobbler, he ought to rule in New Spain."

Most of the Spaniards who became wealthy, returned to Spain, a great many of those who remained behind did so because they were poor. The Church took deep roots in Mexico, over four-fifths of the land in Mexico was in the hands of the religious orders and the Church, growing richer, lost its spiritual hold on the people.

As a proof of the ascendancy of the clergy in political matters, the case of Mexican deputies to the Cortez in Cadiz in 1810, who were almost all canons, may be cited.

The Dominicans alone might be said to have furnished a powerful cause for the overthrow of Spanish rule, at the very time that they were laboring hardest to uphold it as it manifested signs of tottering. And all the orders by seizing and holding vast amounts of property, by building churches and monasteries in times when the people were suffering the most abject poverty, and by enforcing the laws of tithes and gaining control of wealth which should have been applied to encourage industry and relieving the needs of the people, conspired to stimulate the popular discontent which finally broke out into the open revolt. A creole priest raised the standard of revolt in Mexico on September 16th, 1810. His name was Hidalgo, or by his full name, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. He was caught, sentenced to death by the Inquisition and his head with that of four of his lieutenants was stuck on pikes on the four corners of the public square, in Guanajuato in 1811, where they remained until 1821. The greatest military genius of the revolution was another mestizo priest, José Maria Morelos; there were other patriot priests, Mariano Matamoros, Dr. Cos, Navarrete, and Torres.

The Church excommunicated the partisans and authors of Mexican Independence.

It must be known that the clergy violated the secret of the confessional to denounce its enemies, which is one of the reasons for the burning of the confessionals during the ten years' struggle for Independence, in the war of the Reform and during the Constitutionalist revolution.

There is historical proof of this. Don Manuel Iturriaga, canon of Valladolid, who was affiliated with the revolutionary movement, on his deathbed, confessed everything and the conspiracy was discovered because the father confessor violated the secret of the confessional.

Liberalism in Spain threatened the great interests of the Catholic Church in Mexico and therefore it demanded "an absolute separation from Spain and its radicalism."

The clergy began to hold secret consultations with their closest adherents among the "Old Spaniards," and to devise means whereby the rights and prerogatives of the religious orders might be conserved, the immense revenues of the Church saved, and the co-operation of the people of Mexico (whom they had previously estranged) secured

in their interests. Augustin de Iturbide was chosen as the tool by the clergy to effect a union between the Mexican revolutionists and the native army under the orders of the viceroy.

On the 21st of February, 1821, Iturbide succeeded in having the plan of Iguala adopted by the revolutionists. The first Constitution was given the name of the "Three Guarantees," because Religion, Independence and Union were to be symbolized in the national flag, with the colors red, green and white.

Iturbide's defection broke Spanish resistance and he was appointed president of the five regents who represented the government ad interim. In a turbulent meeting of the Congress, from which the republican members were in a measure excluded, Iturbide was elected Emperor of Mexico. He abdicated on the 20th of March, 1823.

Thirty-six articles were adopted in January to serve as a basis for a future Constitution. The third article of the Constitution read as follows: "The Religion of the Mexican nation is, and will perpetually be the Roman Catholic Apostolic. The nation will protect it by wise and just laws, *and prohibit the exercise of any other whatever.*"

Lucas Alaman was the intellectual leader of the clerical party and Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna was its military tool.

In 1832, Gomez Farias, Vice-President, with Santa Anna, proposed the first reforms, that is to say, the abolition of the "fueros" or privileges (1) of the clergy and army, the separation of the Church and State, including the suppression of the monastic orders and more particularly the abolition of the right of the ecclesiastics to interfere in secular affairs.

In 1833, Gomez Farias began a system of government reforms which were only put into execution in 1859, after the three years' war.

Santa Anna played the part of the traitor and tool of the Church until at last he was driven from the country in 1854, but not until he had led his country into two disastrous wars which lost Mexico as much territory as is contained in the whole of Mexico today.

In 1847, when Santa Anna was in the field organizing an army to fight the Americans, "Gomez Farias, who was in charge of the government, proposed a loan of four million dollars from the Church which was practically in possession of all the available wealth of the country. The Church refused and the clericals created dissensions among the troops for the defense of the country." For a month the streets of the capital were scenes of wild confusion and violence.

The efforts of Gomez Farias to obtain assistance of the Church in the prosecution of the war was resisted by the "Polkos" (clericals and gilded youths). While the squadron of the United States was in the Gulf of Mexico, the "Polkos" were seeking to make terms of peace with the United States, without attempting to preserve the integrity of the national territory.

It was the action of the "Polkos" that made the war, on the part of the army of the United States, a mere military progress through Mexico from the borders of the land to the capital.

"The systematic encouragement of desertion from Scott's army was another device in which much reliance was placed, and the plan was so far successful that a certain number, principally Irish Catholics, did desert at Jalapa and Puebla."

The war with Texas, with the United States, French Intervention, were all deliberately planned by the reactionary party so as to avoid a civil war and unite all factions under its flag. As we have said before, Santa Anna was the tool of the Church. The master mind of the clerical party was Lucas Alaman. Some extracts from a letter of Lucas Alaman, to the President-elect Santa Anna, follow:

"We are absolutely opposed to the federal system in the matter of elections which has obtained hitherto and the elective city council (municipal home rule), and to everything which bears any relation to popular elections. . . . And we are persuaded that any and all of these things can be satisfactorily carried out without Congress. We desire, however, that you proceed under the counsel of a few advisers *who will outline your executive action.* . . . We have the moral strength of the united clergy, and likewise the land owners. . . . For the rest we do not care, no matter what your personal convictions may be, to see you surrounded by flatterers who will influence you . . . you are already possessed of our desires, of the strength and the support which is ours, and we presume you have the same ideas. *If it should happen not to prove so, it will be bad for the nation—and you.* . . ."

LUCAS ALAMAN.

The advanced liberals in Mexico promulgated on the 21st of November, 1855, what is known as the "Ley Juarez." The ecclesiastical authorities saw at once, in the passage of the "Ley Juarez" an attack upon the rights of the Church,—their petted fueros—and they protested most vigorously against the passage of the law.

The clerical opposition brought into prominence the Bishop of Puebla, the Rt. Rev. Pelagio Antonio de Labastida y Davalos, who had been but recently advanced to the Episcopate. In March, 1854, he anathemized from the pulpit, as heretical, the doctrines of Ocampo and Miguel Lerdo. His zeal in that regard was rewarded by his elevation to the Episcopate. "Each proposition regarding the new Constitution was an attack upon some abuse that had existed, perhaps for three centuries, and involved the wealth or the influence of some powerful class. It was proposed, for example, to prohibit forced labor, monopolies, alacabalas (or interstate custom duties), the acquisition of property by religious communities. These prohibitions were suggested not as mere doctrinaire theories, but as solutions of some of the social problems presented to the reformers of the Constitution. In opposition to the proceedings of Congress, the Bishops throughout the country issued pastoral letters denouncing the reform propositions and the entire Constituent Congress. They went so far as to excommunicate certain officials in the City of Mexico, who had been active in ex-

ecuting the "Ley Lerdo" as well as all the government officials and even the clerks in the offices."

In January, 1856, the revolt broke out full force. The garrisons of Morelia, Michoacan, Queretaro, San Luis Potosi, Guadadajara and San Juan de Ulloa started "cuartelazos" munities, with the war cry: "Religion y Fueros," religion and privileges, while in Oaxaca, the curates Carlos Parro, Jose Gabriel Castellanos and José Maria Garcia, together with Captain Bonifacio Blanco, headed a military uprising proclaiming the full establishment of the ecclesiastical and military privileges, and the upholding of the Catholic religion to the exclusion of all others. In Jalisco the friars of the monastery of El Carmen joined with the soldiery in a military revolt.

As was to be expected, the clericals were defeated, Santa Anna was driven into exile and the Constitution of 1857 was proclaimed.

Article V says among other things: "The law, in consequence, does not recognize monastic orders, and will not permit their establishment, no matter what may be the denomination or purpose for which they pretend to be established."

Article XXVIII. "The State and Church are independent. Congress cannot make any laws establishing or forbidding any religion . . ."

The Archbishop of Mexico, Don Lazaro de la Garza ,announced in circulars sent to the Bishops a few days after the order for the taking of the oath had been given, that since the articles of this Constitution were inimical to the institution, doctrine and rites of the Catholic Church, neither the clergymen nor laymen could take this oath under any pretext whatever. In view of this communication the Bishops of all the dioceses sent circulars to their respective country vicars and the parish curates and to the other ecclesiastics, informing them, First: That it was not lawful to swear allegiance to the Constitution because its articles were contrary to the institution, doctrines and rites of the Catholic Church. Second: That the communication must be made public and copies of it distributed as widely as possible. Third: That those who had taken this oath must retract it at the confessional and make this retraction as public as possible, and they must notify the government of their action.

Not satisfied with this, the clericals induced Pope Pius IX to issue a bull or mandate to disobey utterly the commands of the impious liberal government. Part of this document is as follows: "Thus we make known to the faith in Mexico and to the Catholic universe, that we energetically condemn every decree that the Mexican government has enacted against the Catholic religion, against the Church and her sacred ministers and pastors, against her laws, rights and property and also against the authority of the Holy See. We raise our Pontifical voice with apostllic freedom before you, to condemn, reprove and declare null, void, and without any value, the said decrees and all others which have been acted by the civil authorities in such contempt of the ecclesiastical authority of this Holy See, and with such injury to the religion, to the sacred pastors and illustrious men."

This remarkable document of the vicar of Christ on earth had its effect; "the friars patrolled the trenches of the revolting soldiery in Mexico City, exciting them to fight; then as in 1847, the clergy paid the wages of the troops, and their agents were bribing the officers of the government that swells the ranks of the enemy."

In spite of all the excommunications and papal bulls, the liberals were victorious in the end and on the 11th of June, 1861, Juarez, the pure blooded Indian was proclaimed Constitutional President of Mexico.

President Juarez expelled some foreign diplomats who had meddled in the political affairs of Mexico by favoring the reactionary elements. This was done to the Archbishop of Mexico, the Bishop of Michoacan and some high members of the clergy. As a consequence of this act, the French minister Saligny, the clergy and the clericals, José M. Gutierrez Estrada, José Manuel Hidalgo and General Juan N. Almonte asked Napoleon III to intervene in Mexico. French intervention took place between 1861 and 1865. This is what a French officer has to say about the behavior of the French soldiers in Mexico: "First of all they (the French) do not take any more prisoners and the wounded are killed. It is a real war of savages, unworthy of the Europeans." (Lieutenant G. Coine.)

The United States recognized Juarez as the Constitutional president. In 1867 the liberals, under Juarez, defeated and drove out the French and in the same year they were victorious against the clericals who supported Maximilian. On the 19th of May, 1867, Maximilian, Miramon and Mejia were judged and condemned to death.

Then followed the presidency of Juarez, Lerdo de Tejada and Porfirio Diaz.

Diaz came in as a revolutionary president and ended in his old age as a supporter of the renascent Catholic party. During the War of the Reform and French Intervention, three generals were at the head of the clericals: Leonardo Marquez, Miramon and Mejia. The first one managed to escape after the fall of the Empire and he lived in Havana in exile until 1898, when he came back to Mexico. At this time Porfirio Diaz was slowly, but surely, showing tendencies of going back to the old régime and Leonardo Marquez, Don Francisco Elguero and Sanchez Santos, who was editor of a Catholic paper called El Pais, collaborated with Diaz in this sense, that they were the originators of the new Catholic party of Mexico. Helping them were Francisco de la Hoz, Francisco Pascual Garcia, Eduardo Tamariz and Fernando Somellera. Francisco Elguero controlled the clergy in Michoacan and represented A. and E. Noriega, Spaniards, in the question of the drainage of the Cienega de Zacapu (Mich) when they despoiled thousands of Indians of their lands, including over fifty square miles. It is well to call attention to the fact that Inigo Noriega, cousin of A. and E. Noriega, was known by popular opinion to be a silent partner of Porfirio Diaz. Fernando Somellera was entirely under the influence of the Archbishop of Mexico and collaborated with him and was assisted by

Carmelita Diaz, wife of Porfirio Diaz. As Porfirio Diaz was getting older, so the ascendancy of Carmelita Diaz increased. The efforts of the Protestants in creating industrial schools and churches in the north of Mexico, accelerated the formation of the secret Catholic party which laid its plans to counteract the influence of the Protestants by creating Catholic schools all over the country, under the tuition of priests and nuns, which were imported by the efforts of Mrs. Diaz. Priests, nuns and friars were imported from France, the same ones that had been expelled from their country, from Spain; some came from the United States. In 1904 some American nuns were brought from Mobile, and Atlanta, and they built a convent sixteen miles from the capital. Many Mexicans became suspicious of these surreptitious immigrations and Felix Diaz, then chief of police under Porfirio Diaz, raided the first convent in 1905 and sent the inmates back to France. Several raids by Felix Diaz followed and three shiploads of nuns were ostensibly sent back to the old country, but when the ships stopped at Progreso, the nuns landed there and after a while returned to Mexico.

The raids took place under the direction of Feliz Diaz, and the round trip tickets of the peripatetic nuns were paid by Carmelita Diaz. It was a game of hide and seek, with the advantage on the side of the wife of the "Old Man."

Carmelita Diaz was so certain that the religious orders had come to stay that she informed the nuns to entertain no fear as to their safety as she was in a position to let them know of any action which might be taken against them.

The Madero revolution was unexpected in its suddenness and violence. It took everybody by surprise, the porfiristas, the cientificos, the clericals, Europe as well as America.

By forcing the elimination of Diaz from power, the reactionary element saved the day for a while, especially as the clerical and reactionary F. L. de la Barra was successfully placed in the provisional presidency. De la Barra prepared the way for the overthrow of the Madero régime by working unceasingly in conjunction with the Catholic party in Mexico and in Washington, to discredit the new political order as represented by Madero. The new Catholic party came openly into being in 1911, when it put forth F. I. Madero as president and F. L. de la Barra as vice-president. Once the ticket was in power there would have been found a way of eliminating Madero; unluckily for the renascent Catholic party, De la Barra was defeated at the polls. In Congress the Catholic party was represented by Elguero and F. de la Hoz and the opposition by F. Iglesias Calderon, Luis Cabrera, J. Urueta, Serapio Rendon and others. The Catholic party had made Madero its candidate, hoping to use him to its ends, but when it was discovered that Madero was not amenable to reason, it began opposing him bitterly, taking sides with every revolutionary movement which was initiated during the Madero régime, among which were the Orozco, Reyes, Felix Diaz revolts and later the Huerta treachery.

During the tragic ten days in Mexico City, when Madero was assas-

sinated, the high Catholic clergy favored the assassins in many ways and later furnishing Huerta with forty million pesos to suppress the revolution. The Catholic prelates did not trust Felix Diaz because of his well known raids of convents and, therefore, they did not offer him the presidency, but concentrated all their efforts on Huerta, until they succeeded in putting him in power.

Although Huerta's friends claim that he was innocent of the murder of Madero by direct order, nevertheless it is an open secret that Rodolfo Reyes demanded the heads of Madero, Suarez and Basso, in revenge for his father's death; the other members of the cabinet demanded the head of Gustavo Madero, who was murdered in the citadel where Felix Diaz had his headquarters.

Huerta's professional secret is a secret of polichinelle, as every child knows that the murderous deed was a stepping stone to his dictatorship. Huerta was the tacit accessory to the crime. No matter how many palliatory arguments the Mexican and American clericals may give to white-wash their good friend Huerta, he can exclaim as Lady Macbeth: "Here's the smell of blood still; all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand."

One of Huerta's great political blunders was the naming of the clerical E. Tamariz as minister of public instruction, thus giving one of the most important portfolios to the Catholics. The whole Congress protested most vigorously and it was then that the dictator had them all put in jail, except the Catholic members, and then named a Congress of his own.

Doctor Urrutia, a pupil of the Jesuit College, was the Iago of the clerical party, his friendship and influence over Huerta served him admirably, having been his political mentor and prompter since 1908, when Diaz was still in power. The great chance arrived during Madero's régime. As Huerta was only a soldier and not a politician, the clerical party picked out Dr. Urrutia as a president molder and accelerator. Up to that time Dr. Urrutia was known as the most brilliant and successful surgeon in Mexico.

When Huerta achieved power Dr. Urrutia became a member of his cabinet and official executioner of the most important enemies of his régime; scores of well known victims disappeared mysteriously, among them a senator, Belsario Dominguez and an anti-clerical deputy, the Lic. Serapio Rendon. Dr. Urrutia was the most powerful, dreaded, hated man in Mexico; he was the modern inquisitor and hangman of the clerical party; but instead of cowing the Mexicans into submission, he drove the best element into the arms of the new revolution.

But the clericals soon discovered to their discomfiture that Huerta, with all his ruthlessness, his cunning, cruelties, and his much-vaunted strength, was really losing his grip on Mexico and that he had very little chance of being recognized by the Washington administration, therefore, they began casting about for another clerical presidential possibility. Dr. Urrutia was chosen as the only convenient and obedient instrument of the Church. Thereupon the high clergy began

to conspire the "accidental removal" of the dictator. A letter from the Archbishop of Michoacan to Dr. Urrutia revealed the intrigue. It says in part: "My profound sympathy and affection for you make me fear that these men's intrigues might put an obstacle on the path that our Lord and Blessed Mother have put before you to *climb to the culminating position of Chief Executive of the Republic,* which position will require of you the greatest sacrifice, but will at the same time lay before you a vast field in which to exercise your activity for the glory and honor of God and for the benefit of our beloved country."

Huerta got wind of this little scheme to eliminate him, and sent his agents to arrest Dr. Urrutia and the conspiring prelates. Dr. Urrutia escaped by the skin of his teeth to Vera Cruz, where he begged the protection of Gen. Funston against the infuriated Mexicans who were ready to lynch him. All the Mexican Bishops and Archbishops, involved in the plot, fled from the wrath of Huerta and placed themselves under the protection of the clerical Brazilian minister who represented the United States. Later they were smuggled out of Mexico City. The American press gave as reason for their sudden escape from Mexico an alleged conspiracy to get rid of them by the Constitutionalists, although at that time they controlled neither Mexico City nor Vera Cruz.

Vera Cruz became the center of political intrigue under the protection of the American flag, against Huerta, against the Constitutionalists and in favor of intervention, that is to say, in favor of a quick march and occupation of Mexico City by the American troops.

One of the reasons for the insistent demand that Vera Cruz should be put under American control, was that that seaport was an ideal spot for revolutionary intrigue, first for its nearness to the capital and secondly because the clericals, under the shadow of the American flag, could continue formenting revolts until a clerical had been placed in power in Mexico City. The disappointment was great when the American troops left and Carranza's soldiers entered the city of Vera Cruz.

Nuns, friars, priests ,prelates, ex-federals, ex-cabinet members, all the revolutionary rig raff of Mexico, which had been playing politics, left for Havana and the United States. The exiled Catholics were received by their fellow believers in the United States and soon afterwards all the Catholic dailies, weeklies, monthlies were filled with stories of alleged persecutions and rapes and robberies committed by the revolutionists.

A pamphlet, relating all these atrocities, was published in Chicago, containing articles with replies to a pamphlet by John Lind and another by Col. I. C. Enriquez, a Mexican Catholic who had fought under General Obregon and who denied the charges made by the exiles and their friends in the United States. The answer in this lurid pamphlet was ostensibly signed by an American Catholic priest, but had really been written by the Mexican editor of "El Pais" (a Catholic daily in Mexico City) and translated for the benefit of the American author who never knew anything about Mexican history until the pamphlet was printed.

The fourth edition of this booklet ran to almost 100,000 copies, at fifteen cents a copy, so you can figure out for yourself that this christian shepherd reaped from the alleged sufferings of the political martyrs a financial bonanza.

The strangest part of this so-called religious persecutions is a fact which stands out glaringly, and that is that no Protestant clergymen were ever molested in Mexico.

Why should the Indians and the middle class Mexicans, who are all Catholics, want to persecute and drive out their own "sky pilots" unless they had meddled in politics and taken sides with the oppressors, thus placing themselves outside the pale of the law? Why is it that the lower clergy has remained in Mexico and continues to attend to its spiritual duties without being molested by the Constitutionalists?

This simple fact destroys all the statements published by the American Catholic press that the Constitutionalists are persecuting the Catholic religion. What the revolutionists have really been doing was to weed out and extirpate forever the political scum and interlopers in Mexico.

While the American troops were in possession of Vera Cruz, a list was made by General José Refugio Velasco, of all the ex-federal generals who were in that port, this list showing that there were more than 450 ex-federal generals plotting more trouble under the protection of the American flag.

This proves the harmful influence of unwarranted foreign occupation. While the American troops were supposed to be doing good by enforcing peace and the respect of rights, they were harboring a nest of trouble brewers, thereby making more difficult the already difficult task undertaken by Don Venustiano Carranza—that of pacifying the Republic.

It is also shown that Major Frank Joyce, an officer of the 14th Regiment of Artillery, which was sent to Vera Cruz, showed more than the usual interest in getting together stories told by the refugees, of atrocities and persecutions against monks and nuns, without troubling himself to find out whether those stories were true or not. They were stories of monks having been shot in Guadalajara, and of nuns who had been outraged by the soldiers. Allowing that anything of the kind might have happened in isolated instances, it was the exception and not the rule, and if Major Joyce had taken the trouble, he would have found that most of the stories told him were —— stories, told for the purpose of capturing the sympathies of an unsuspecting public, which did not know that the laws of Mexico expressly forbid the presence of religious orders, under any pretext whatever.

Those stories Major Joyce carefully gathered and sent copies to Cardinal Farley and to the Hon. William J. Bryan in Washington. Father Carlos de Heredia, who, while in New York, stopped at the Church of St. Francis Xavier, making a trip to Washington in December, 1914, where he had a conference with Secretary Bryan. He left immediately afterwards for Havana, to interview the monks and nuns

in that city, under instructions of Cardinal Farley. Major Joyce pushed his zeal to such an extent as to make a trip to Mexico City incognito, just to see if he could get hold of anything on which he could make more charges against the Constitutionalists.

Mr. S. Augusto Zubieta declared that he knew that the last effort of the Catholic party was to back a new revolutionary movement, at the head of which they wanted to place Felix Diaz and General Iturbide. The Catholic party had already put in the hands of Felix Diaz, through an American prelate, a check for ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS, with which Don Felix was to go to Havana to rally his followers and begin his preparation to start a new revolution. Their plan was to charter vessels which would land arms and ammunition on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, from which they would work into Oaxaca and there begin operation against Carranza.

All this was being done with the active support of the Catholic party in the United States, which influenced by the false reports circulated by the enemies of the Constitutionalists had from the beginning antagonized the revolution.

Herewith is printed an affidavit, written and sworn to by Mr. S. A. Zubieta, a Mexican Catholic and an ex-federal officer:

I, Salvador A. Zubieta, do hereby declare that on or about December, 1914 and January, 1915, I had occasion to meet Cardinal ——— and talking over the Mexican situation, we discussed several questions of importance, among them the alleged actions of Carranza against the Catholic Church and he confided to me that the Catholics in this country were disposed to back a new revolution, of which Felix Diaz was to be the head. The instigator of this movement is the well known murderer, Cecilio Ocon, who seems to have gained the ear and the confidence of Cardinal ———, the said Cardinal having believed unquestioningly all the false representations made by this unscrupulous murderer. The Cardinal also asked if I would help in this, probably because he thought my family connections in Mexico and the fact of my being a Catholic, would gain some advantage to the cause. Cardinal ——— also stated that many Catholic institutions in this country were ready to back this movement with about *ten million dollars.*

New York City, February 27th, 1915.

(Signed) Sal. Augusto Zubieta.

State of New York } S.S.
County of New York }

Sworn before me this 27th
day of February, 1915.

(Signed) W. J. Berow,
Notary Public,
New York County No. 374.
New York Reg. No. 5255.

[SEAL]

William J. Berow,
Notary Public,
New York County.

This remarkable document proves two things: one that the Catholic party in the United States is playing politics surreptitiously, and secondly, that it is not doing it intelligently. If the history of the rise and downfall of the political power of the Catholic Church in Europe is not an obvious lesson to the Catholic politicians in America, certainly the defeat of its political power in Mexico should be a warning.

The religious strength, dogmas and spirituality of the Catholic Church cannot be discussed here as not belonging to this argument. It is the same old story. It begins everywhere modestly, keeping to its spiritual duties. Slowly, but surely, it acquires wealth, real estate, a press of its own and then falls to the all-mastering ambition and is tempted to play politics—which is invariably followed by its political elimination.

If the master minds in Rome were defeated and lost the temporal power of the Church in Italy, where the Catholics are in a majority, how can picayune clerical politicians in the United States hope to control America politically, where the Catholics are in a minority?

After forty years of hostility to the Italian Government the Holy See realized its mistake and made advances. In an interview with Italian Catholics, Pope Benedict XV stated that the Italian Catholics should be first of all Italians. This was said to offset the publicity given by the enemies of the Holy See that the interests of the Catholic Church were with Austria and its political integrity, as against Italy and its government, which had despoiled it of its temporal power.

This attitude of the present Pope was not only eminently Christian but also statesmanlike. Pope Benedict XV ought to be and he will be informed of the intrigues of the Mexican prelates and the Mexican clergy to foment revolutions and bloodshed so as to incite the American Government to intervene in Mexico.

To prove that the Mexican prelates now exiled in the United States are not in sympathy with Mexican aims, struggles and sufferings we quote the following from the "Pueblo" in Vera Cruz, March 26th, 1915.

A protest from the Catholic priests in Mexico.

To Don Venustiano Carranza, Chief of the Constitutionalist army and in charge of the Executive Power of the Union:

"We, the undersigned Catholic priests of the Archbishopric of Mexico, take pleasure in stating that it is with regret and disapproval that we have seen a number of Catholic refugees in foreign countries, acting on the advice and under the influence of an association which with the pretext of protecting the Catholic cause, has long been trying to interfere in our national affairs, address a petition to a foreign government for the protection of the Church in Mexico. We protest to you that none of us have taken part in these measures which we consider antipatriotic and unnecessary. It is true that we have to lament several injuries in persons and things pertaining to the cult and service of the Church, but we consider all this a sad consequence of the revolution which has affected our country in its very foundation, and which, on

tearing up many harmful elements, sweeps away at the same time, with irresistable force, others which are harmless; but we confess that on part of the most distinguished personalities of the revolution, we have received attentions for which we are thankful, and many times also, the guarantees to which we are entitled as Mexican citizens. We trust therefore, without resorting to any foreign power, to succeed in obtaining all the guarantees and rights consistent with the laws that govern us, which will permit us, far from all political action, to devote ourselves to the moralization of the poor and to the pacification of our country, on the basis of the respect which is due to the constituted authority and fraternity of all Mexicans. Please accept this manifestation of our feelings and our gratitude and respect."

Following are the signatures of the Catholic priests:

Dr. Antonio J. Paredes, Vicar General of the Archbishopric of Mexico; Jose Cortes, rector; Silvestre Hernandez, Clemente M. Cordoba, Francisco 9. Alvarez, Manuel Rodriguez F., Edoardo D. Paredes, Bruno Martinez, Guillermo Trischler, Gerardo Anaya, Augustin Alvarez, Domingo Rojas, Felipe de la O, Manuel Cadenas, Alberto Gosca.

Then followed the signatures of several Spanish priests.

This manifesto or protest of the Mexican Catholic priests should be a salutary lesson in ethics and Christianity to the militant Catholic politicians and trouble-makers in the United States.

The historical facts in this pamphlet are taken from the following authors:

From Empire to Republic, A. H. Noll; Historia del Pueblo Mexicano, Carlos Pereyra; De la Dictatura a la Anarquia, Ramon Prida; A Short History of Mexico, A. H. Noll; The United States and Mexico, 1821-1848, G. L. Rives; The Mexican People and their struggle for Freedom, L. G. de Lara and E. Pinchon; Mexico a traves de los siglos; Compendio de la Historia de Mexico, L. P. Verdia.

The American Catholic papers have advertised the news that millions of property belonging to the Catholic Church in Mexico, had been either destroyed or confiscated by the Constitutionalists. The Catholic Church in Mexico has not owned any property since 1859 and even the churches are government property which are rented out to the clergy. The fact that religious orders are forbidden to stay, in other words, are outlawed in Mexico, was never mentioned by the Catholic clergy. All through the revolution prominent Catholics and the Catholic press have attacked the Constitutionalists either in ignorance or bad faith. A continuation of a campaign of misstatements, hostility and hatred by the American Catholics, will only succeed in driving the Mexicans to do what the Catholics fear most: they will throw them into the arms of the Protestant Church, which will act as a healthy balance against the political designs of the Catholic Church.

Extracts from the Laws of the Reform.

Law of July 21st, 1859.

Art. 3. There shall be perfect independence between the affairs of the State and the affairs purely ecclesiastical. The government will limit itself to protecting with its authority the public worship of the Catholic religion and any other religion.

Art. 4. The ministers of the faith for the administration of the sacraments and other religious functions will be permitted to accept gifts and oblations offered in return for services rendered, but neither gifts nor indemnities shall be rendered in the form of real estate.

Art. 5. The existent religious orders, irrespective of denomination or for what purpose created, and all archconfraternities, confraternities and brotherhoods connected with the religious communities and the cathedrals, parishes or any churches, shall be suppressed throughout the entire republic.

Art. 6. The foundation and erection of new convents or religious orders of archconfraternities, confraternities or brotherhoods of whatever form or appellation is prohibited. Likewise the wearing of the garb of the suppressed orders is forbidden.

Law of December 14th, 1874.

First Section.

Art. 1. The State and the Church are independent of each other.—

No one will be empowered to dictate laws establishing or prohibiting any religion; but the State exercises authority over them, in relation to the conservation of public order and the respect of its institutions.

Art. 2. The State in the Republic guarantees the exercise of all cults.—

It will prosecute and punish only those practices and acts, authorized by some cult, which may be in violation of our penal laws.

Second Section.

Art. 14. No religious institution may acquire real estate or capital invested in real estate with the exception of the temples to be used solely for the public service of the cult or the buildings which may be strictly necessary for such service.

Third Section.

Art. 19. The State does not recognize any monastic order nor can it permit their establishment, no matter what the denomination or object under which they may have been created.—

The Secret orders which have been established shall be considered as illegal and the authorities can dissolve them should their members live in Communities; and in any case, their chiefs, superiors or directors will be judged as guilty of an infraction of individual guarantees, in conformity to Article 963 of the Penal Code of the district, to be enforced in the whole Republic.

Art. 20. All religious societies whose individuals live under certain peculiar laws by virtue of promises or temporary or perpetual vows subject to one or more superiors, even when the individuals of the orders shall live in different places, shall be considered monastic orders in conformity with the foregoing article.—

(1) The clergy and the army were tried by their own courts.

REPLY OF CARDINAL FARLEY.

New York *Times*—

Cardinal Farley made the following statement from his residence, 452 Madison Avenue:

New York, March 4, 1916.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

Page seven of today's issue of The New York *Times* has a reference to and long quotations from a pamphlet entitled "What the Catholic Church Has Done to Mexico," by Dr. A. Paganel of Mexico City. This document has been circulated very extensively in this country, and has been sent to the members of Congress. It has never been referred to or quoted in the columns of the metropolitan press until today.

Dr. Paganel mentions my name twice in his pamphlet, and also prints an affidavit sworn to by "S. A. Zubieta, a Mexican Catholic and an ex-federal officer," in which it is charged that the Catholic Church in the United States is ready to back a revolution against the Carranza Government with $10,000,000.

First of all a charge is made that "one of the reasons for the insistent demand that Vera Cruz should be put under American control, was that the seaport was an ideal spot for revolutionary intrigue, first for its nearness to the capital and secondly because the clericals, under the shadow of the American flag, could continue formenting revolts until a clerical had been placed in power in Mexico City." The only revolts fomented under the shadow of the flag in Vera Cruz were the stories of the outraged nuns and persecuted priests and Bishops, who sought refuge and sanctuary there, and who consequently were able to tell the world the real nature of the task undertaken by the great pacifist, Don Venustiano Carranza.

Major Joyce's Charges.

Major Francis Joyce, Catholic Chaplain of the Fourteenth Regiment of Artillery, is charged with having sent copies of the stories told him by the refugees in Vera Cruz to "Cardinal Farley and to the Hon. William J. Bryan in Washington." Any fair-minded citizen of this country will scarcely find fault with the Major's action. He wanted both the Government of the country and the representatives of the Catholic Church in the United States to know the real condition of affairs. Major Joyce's communication to me was confidential. I have had occasion to learn that Major Joyce told the truth, and the progress of events since the American occupation of Vera Cruz leads me to believe that he must be a particularly obnoxious person to the present Government of Mexico, and to such an apologist as the writer of the pamphlet in question, because he defended truth and justice and morality.

I am charged also with having sent the Rev. Carlos de Heredia to Havana with instructions to interview the monks and nuns in that city.

The only connection I have ever had with the Rev. Father Heredia, who was a Jesuit refugee from Mexico and was in this city during the latter part of 1914, is that I listened to his story on religious conditions in Mexico, and tried to help some artist friend of his, who was in distress. Father Heredia also tried to make the truth known, and fought for justice and morality, and I have no doubt that he is persona non grata with the Carranzistas.

A much more serious charge, however, is that quoted in the *Times* this morning, that "the Catholic party of Mexico had already put into the hands of Felix Diaz, through an American prelate, a check for $100,000, with which Don Felix was to go to Havana to rally his followers and begin his preparation to start a new revolution."

QUOTES FROM PAMPHLET.

The authority for this statement seems to be S. Augusto Zubieta, who "declared he knew that the last effort of the Catholic party was to back a new revolutionary movement," etc. There follows in the pamphlet an affidavit sworn to by him before William J. Berow, a notary of New York County, on Feb. 27, 1915. This affidavit reads as follows:

> I, Salvador A. Zubieta, do hereby declare that on or about December, 1914, and January, 1915, I had occasion to meet Cardinal ——, and, talking over the Mexican situation, we discussed several questions of importance, among them the alleged actions of Carranza against the Catholic Church, and he confided to me that the Catholics in this country were disposed to back a new revolution, of which Felix Diaz was to be the head. The in stigator of this movement is the well-known murderer, Cecilio Ocon, who seems to have gained the ear and the confidence of Cardinal ——, the said Cardinal having believed unquestioningly all the false representations made by this unscrupulous murderer. The Cardinal also asked if I would help in this, probably because he thought my family connections in Mexico and the fact of my being a Catholic would gain some advantage to the cause. Cardinal —— also stated that many Catholic institutions in this country were ready to back this movement with about $10,000,000.
>
> SAL. AUGUSTO ZUBIETA.
>
> New York City, February 27, 1915.

As I had occasion to meet Mr. Zubieta in December, 1914, (neither myself nor my secretary being able to recall the January meeting), I presume that I must thank Dr. Paganel for not mentioning my name in such an odious connection. Colonel Zubieta, as he represented himself, called at my residence and I received him and listened to his account of the Mexican difficulties. Just at that time I was listening to everyone who could give me any information about Mexico, as I had returned shortly before from a rather extended trip to Europe. I also listened to the story of the Colonel's distress, and as the Colonel himself has been kind enough to inform me, I sent him to Mr. Paul Fuller, who furnished him with a letter of introduction to a Mr. W. S. Valentine,

with whom he obtained employment. On December 31, 1914, Colonel Zubieta wrote me the following letter:

Eminence: With the greatest respect I take the liberty to address these lines to your Eminence in order to expose my actual unfortunate situation, and respectfully request your kind assistance.

As directed by your Eminence, I visited Mr. Paul Fuller, who had the kindness to provide me with a letter of introduction to Mr. W. S. Valentine, who employed me in their service, but unhappily this position lasted only two weeks, and now I have the misfortune to find myself again under the same sad conditions. My debts are increasing daily, and my credit in the house where I am boarding has already reached its limit.

Now, to add another sorrow to those already weighing upon my existence I have just received the news that my mother's health is so delicate that her life is seriously endangered.

I beg to appeal to your Eminence as the sole being on whom I can place my only hopes for assistance, with the assurance that if you should have the kindness to provide me with the means to return to my country, I shall not only return to your Eminence the amount received, but also be thankful to you for life.

I pray that your Eminence may enjoy the best health, and, wishing for your Excellence a happy and bright New Year, I remain very respectfully yours,

COL. SALV. AUGUSTO ZUBIETA.

SENT AID TO ZUBIETA.

In reply to this very touching appeal I sent through my secretary, the Rev. Thomas G. Carroll, a check for $25 with the following note:

January 8, 1915.

Dear Colonel: His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop, directs me to forward you the inclosed amount, ($25), in reply to your request of the 31st ult., and regrets that he has overlooked the matter until now. He hopes this will not arrive too late, and is sorry to learn that your mother is unwell. With best wishes, I am sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. CARROLL, Secretary.

Colonel Salvator A. Zubieta, 162 West Eightieth Street.

Colonel Zubieta never acknowledged the receipt of my charity, nor have I ever heard from him since. I know that he indorsed the check to some one named Alice Gonzalez, and as I think of the matter now I wonder why I did not draw on the large revolutionary fund at my disposal to be of greater assistance to the Colonel.

I think Colonel Zubieta's letter to me offers sufficient denial of the charges he makes, and I consider that the publication of it is another

evidence of the methods employed by the present Government in Mexico to discredit its opponents.

Because I frankly admit that I am opposed to this Government, which has established itself by appealing to the worst elements in the country and secured its power and ascendency in the early stages of its growth by disregarding every principle of justice and morality. And I am confident that the day is not far distant when the great mass of the Mexican people will be released from the tyrannical yoke that it has imposed on them. What Dr. Paganel and his friends are really anxious about is that the world may not learn what the present Constitutionalist Government has done to Mexico and the Catholic Church in Mexico.

JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY,
Archbishop of New York.

An impartial reading of Cardinal Farley's letter to the *Times* in reply to the accusations and the affidavit of Col. S. A. Zubieta brings forth first one glaring fact, that the Cardinal does not deny flatly the charges made by Col. Zubieta, but devotes almost a column of space to incriminations of bad faith, ingratitude against the Colonel.

It does not seem clear how the publication of the letters of S. A. Zubieta makes the charge less serious. It simply proves that the gratitude towards the benefactor could not stand the strain of indignation and patriotism of a Mexican soldier and a Catholic, who discovered that foreign prelates were plotting to plunge Mexico into another civil war.

Secondly, the name of the Cardinal was not mentioned in the affidavit: there are other Cardinals in America.

Third, the Cardinal is very generous with the words, truth, justice and morality.

Is it considered truthful, just and moral by the Cardinals, the Right Reverends and Reverends of the Catholic Church in America to speak of the persecutions of the nuns and friars in Mexico and *never* mention the fact that their very presence there (disguised as civilians) is against the laws of Mexico and has been so since 1859? To speak and publish broadcast about the destruction of Church property, when it is well known that the Catholic Church has not legally owned any property in Mexico since 1859? Is it considered moral and just by Christian prelates to foment trouble, discord and finance a revolution in a foreign country, for the sake of revenge or for the purpose of acquiring temporal power?

The war of 1847 had been represented in the Mexican papers, of the time, as being, on the part of the United States, a war of rapine and plunder, a war on "impiety" conducted by heretics, who were

bent on robbing the churches and destroying true religion.

At present, and for over a year, the Mexican clericals in conjunction with the American clericals have joined in a campaign of vilification against the Mexicans and active propaganda for American Intervention.

It seems grotesque that the American clericals do not realize the immorality of their demands: that the United States Government should invade Mexico, kill several thousand Mexicans and Americans, spend several millions of the tax payers money for the sake of avenging the persecutions and death of foreign nuns and monks who were outlawed and the restoration of property which does not belong to them?

The American clericals are befogging the issue by trying to make it appear a religious instead of a political question. The American Catholics are not such children and dunces as to be forever deceived by evasions and misrepresentations. Truth, justice and morality will out, like murder.

One thing can be safely prophesied: the Mexicans have released themselves of the tyrannical yoke of the clericals and their political rule in Mexico and they will *never willingly* and freely place themselves under their rule again.

The American prelates and the American Catholic politicians had better keep away and not meddle in Mexican politics—or they might burn their fingers in the attempt.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 015 991 130 5